DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 677 HE 010 391

AUTHOR Mathis, B. Claude
TITLE Faculty Development as Human Resource Development.
PUB DATE 22 Mar 77
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at a meeting of the American Association for Higher Education (Chicago, Illinois, March 22, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; *Faculty Development; Faculty Evaluation; Governance; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Models; Personal Growth; Seniority; *Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

Faculty development is distinguished in this speech from the business model of human resource development on numerous issues including the fact that human resource development in business and industry values productivity, and higher education is not committed to making money. Faculty development is more concerned with the growth of individuals while human resource development in industry or business is specifically related to the needs of the system it serves and the performance of specific jobs. The concepts of faculty development and instructional development are distinguished, and several models for faculty development are described. Faculty roles in four basic areas are considered that are significant for faculty development programs that seek to merge individual and institutional objectives. Faculty development efforts need to examine issues concerning faculty governance, collective bargaining, faculty evaluation, disciplinary associations, and the older faculty member. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

- ED158677

# FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AS HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

B. Claude Mathis

Northwestern University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Claude Mathis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

American Association for Higher Education
Chicago, Illinois
March 22, 1977

HE010 391

# FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AS HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

B. Claude Mathis
Northwestern University

The attention given in the United States during the past decade to the cause of conservation may well lead to our being labeled the conservation society in the history books of the future. The need to conserve a resource grows from an awareness of the worth which that resource has for contributing to a goal or value thought to be important. A philosophy of conservation is not new to our society; what has been added is the realization that human as well as natural resources are worth conserving. Human resource development is beginning to emerge as a programmatic manifestation of national concern about human resources -- motivated as much by the demands of those who are the resource as by the needs of the many systems they serve.

The importance of human resources in making things work effectively and efficiently in our world is so pervasive that the human element in the past was often taken for granted. Today the faceless worker in the modern industrial state has given way to the articulate voice which speaks in many social and political ways to the quest for an individual and humanely rewarding identity in whatever context talents are applied.

Faculty development is one form of human resource development which addresses the many roles that academicians have in maintaining the vitality of higher education and in sustaining the value of post-secondary institutions as a necessary national resource. Faculty development, however, should not be confused with programs of human resource development in other labor intensive settings. The frequent description of higher education as a labor intensive industry may suggest that the utilization of human resources in the form of faculty should follow the same general patterns common to big business. Peter Drucker argues forcefully for this point of view in his recent statement in The Chronicle of Higher Education. He writes as follows:

> In their own self-interest, faculty members need radically new policy in three areas. They need an effective substitute for a self-defeating tenure policy. They need systematic personnel development to enable them to benefit from future opportunities. And they need organized placement of the middle-aged, "average" professor in work careers outside of academe. But, above all, faculty members need management -- either self-imposed management or management by administration. [1]

Many post-secondary institutions are drifting toward a concept of faculty development which follows the Drucker plan for salvation by abolishing tenure rather than finding a way to make it work, by instituting programs of personnel development concerned more with issues of efficiency than effectiveness, and by finding ways to get rid of the older average professor rather than concentrating on efforts to improve the average. All of this is administered by a super-elite of academic managers who themselves may never have held an academic appointment.

The business model for developing human resources may appear on the surface to be as humanizing as faculty development programs appear to be for colleges and universities. A number of basic differences, however, shape these two efforts to conserve human resources. These are:

1. The industrial, or business, model for human resource development values the human resource for what can ultimately be contributed to productivity. To develop a human resource in this context is to either sustain or increase the human contribution to economic growth.
2. Higher education is not committed to making money. Its product is the quality of the educational effort it is able to organize and sustain.
3. The quality of education in most post-secondary institutions is determined by faculty decisions made about curriculum, admissions and degree requirements, and promotion and retention of peers. Workers at General Motors do not vote on the best design for

---

[1] Drucker, Peter, "The Professor as Featherbedder," The Chronicle of Higher Education, 13(20), January 31, 1977, p. 24.

the cars they produce each year.

4. Industrial workers and business professionals do not usually participate in the governance of their organizations. The distribution of power in the world of business is arranged much more hierarchially then in higher education where power is distributed diffusely.
5. The options available to faculty members for impacting the quality of education are more numerous than options available to most workers in industry and business.
6. Human resource development in the context of a business or an industry is specifically related to the needs of the system it serves and is designed to enhance performance on specific jobs within that system. The evaluations of these programs involve determining the contributions they make to the outputs of the system.
7. Faculty development, and human resource development in para-educational settings, is not directed as much toward the specific needs of a well defined system as they are concerned with the growth and development of individuals within the system. The ultimate evaluation of faculty development programs should be the contributions made to the social and intellectual maturity of faculty and students. Faculty development is a process for keeping faculty responsive to the basic reason for their existence as faculty -- to educate students and <u>each other</u> in a manner which is best for each. [2]
8. Human resource development in non-educational settings lacks this basic value of self-determination in decisions about the aims and purposes of development.

The quick emergence of faculty development as a concern in higher education leaves the concept more as a need in search of a meaning than a well articulated theory for viewing faculty as the major resource for controlling quality in the educational experiences offered by post-secondary institutions. Much emphasis

---

[2] See, Cross, K. Patricia, <u>Accent on Learning</u>, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

has been given to equating faculty development with the improvement of teaching. Faculty development is often thought of as synonymous with instructional development. The difference between these two constructs is more that of degree than of kind. One basic distinction, however, is important in defining the degree of the difference. Instructional development calls for confronting the process of teaching and learning at the entry point of the classroom through an examination of the interactions between student, teacher, and method. Faculty development is emerging as a construct which is more humanistic in its emphasis on the person of the individual faculty member as the entry point into a confrontation about teaching and learning. This entry point may or may not lead to the classroom as the locus for intervention or to the teaching process as the only activity for faculty which is important in determining the quality of education.

The introduction of faculty development efforts into the fabric of higher education has produced much rhetoric but very little scholarly conceptualization for the logic needed to make faculty development part of the new traditions of higher education. Bergquist and Phillips' model represents one attempt to give some conceptual meaning to the term.[3] They stress three dimensions of faculty development; the role of faculty in organizational or structure type functions, instructional or process type functions, and personal or attitudiral type functions. A close inspection of their categories shows that a powerful scholarship in the field of higher education and organizational management can be related to faculty development. Faculty development is not an idea attempting to survive the excitement which created it. The contemporary literature about faculty development represents a fresh look at many old problems in higher education. To ignore this logical link with past scholarship will make of faculty development a rhetorical exercise which is forgotten when a fad more stimulating takes its place.

Others have offered models for faculty development programs. Toombs emphasizes a professional dimension, a curriculum dimension, and an institutional dimension.[4] He calls attention to the need for thinking of faculty development

---

3 Bergquist, William H., and Phillips, Steven R., "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program", Journal of Higher Education, 46(2), 1975, 177-211.

4 Toombs, William, "A Three-Dimensional View of Faculty Development", Journal of Higher Education, 46(6), 1975, 701-717.

in broader terms than as a concern for the improvement of teaching.

In another analysis, Francis discusses the stages through which attitudes about faculty development evolve in campuses with such programs.[5] He identifies a consciousness-raising stage in which current attitudes are challenged in order to increase awareness of them, a focal-awareness stage where attention is directed to substituting new attitudes and behavior patterns for old ones, and a subsidiary-awareness stage in which new attitudes and behaviors become firmly established.

Simerly has recently summarized much of this literature by classifying ways to view faculty development on a scale from those efforts which would seem to have the least impact to those which would seem to have the most impact.[6] The strategy which is rated as having the least impact on the quality of education is one which emphasizes hiring competent people and leaving them alone. Faculty development at this level is largely a process of selection further refined by the addition of the tenure-promotion process. At the next level of impact Simerly identifies the strategy of introducing and initiating new faculty to the institutional culture through both formal and informal orientation. This strategy is followed in order by faculty development as career development, faculty development as curriculum reform, and faculty development as a concept in which the goals and objectives of both the individual and the institution merge. The strategy which, according to Simerly, will have the most impact is that of:

> . . . faculty development as an organizational goal /which/ represents a conscious organizational commitment to the complex process of deliberately planning for the most effective use of the human resource of the faculty. (Simerly, p. 48)

The difference between human resource development in higher education and in other settings is delineated quite precisely at the point of defining the "effective use" of human resources in one context or the other. The effective use of a faculty member in a college or university is different

---

5 Francis, J. Bruce, "How Do We Get There From Here? Program Design for Faculty Development", Journal of Higher Education, 46(6), 1975, 719-732.

6 Simerly, Robert, "Ways To View Faculty Development", Educational Technology, 17(2), 1977, 47-49.

from the effective use of a worker or a professional in industry or business. To make of higher education an industry or a business is to deny its historic meaning as a center for liberating learnings.

Scholarship and research about faculty development is desperately needed in order to understand the features of present ad hoc attempts. The responsibility for this scholarship and research should not be left to psychologists and specialists in higher education. One of the serious challenges for faculty development is that of stimulating scholars in all disciplines to contribute to the literature rather than only participate in the events which others may analyze and record.

Faculty development programs which have as their goal the merging of individual and institutional objectives into a mission of education for each should have elements which deal with faculty roles in four basic arenas of discourse. The first of these is the role a faculty member has in the articulation and development of a sense of institutional mission. This definition of mission is as much a projection of contemporary faculty values as it is institutional tradition. If faculty are to have any responsibility for realizing this mission they should participate actively in making it explicit.

The second area of concern involves the manner in which the institution examines its mission after making it explicit. The whole process of faculty governance is critical at this point. Most institutions have faculty governance procedures but without explicit relationship to institutional mission and without any procedure to prepare faculty for informed participation in the governance process.

The third area is the one which has become the focus for most faculty development programs. This involves efforts for making operational the mission of the institution. Teaching, research, scholarship, the curriculum, and the learning environment are the dominant issues here.

The fourth area involves an actively and broadly based evaluation of the institutional mission which is ongoing and concerned with the assessment of the quality of education. Faculty should have a major role in the activities and concerns of all four of these areas.

The recent report from the Educational Testing Service about faculty development in colleges and universities in the United States indicates that the present state of the art has not progressed far beyond "tinkering" with teaching.[7] Most programs emphasize the improvement of teaching, and most do so by attempting to improve those who want to get better rather than those whose need for improvement is clearly indicated. Helping the productive stay that way rather than changing those who are clearly ineffective may be a characteristic of all human resource development programs, at least in their beginning years. Faculty development will need to reach beyond this limited commitment, however, if institutional change in the interest of educational quality is to be forthcoming. The future of faculty development programs lies in confronting a number of agenda in higher education not now being identified as legitimate concerns for faculty development efforts. Among these are:

1. Faculty Governance -- The vitality of post-secondary institutions is directly related to the commitments faculty make to keep them vital. Participation in decision making is one way of maintaining this vitality. Faculty governance represents the structure for this participation. Faculty development efforts should include activities to help faculty learn to participate in this governance procedure in an informed and rational manner which will validate the legitimacy of the governance process. Those institutions to survive the hard times of the present will be the ones which have learned to govern themselves with the kind of collegiality expected of the academy but seldom found in actuality. Most faculty are totally unprepared for the informed and knowledgable participation needed to analyze budgets, make rational decisions about promotion and retention, judge effective teaching, and assess the importance and impact of curriculum changes. Graduate training programs do not include learning about the issues which cut across departments. Faculty development programs should begin to accept the responsibility for providing activities for faculty which will help them approach their task of governance with some insight about their institutions other

---

[7] Centra, John A., Faculty Development Practices in U. S. Colleges and Universities, Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, November, 1976.

than those gained around the coffee pots in their own departments.

2. Collective Bargaining -- Collective bargaining agreements between faculty and the Boards of the institutions they represent appear to be the wave of the future with respect to distributing power in higher education. Such agreements may or may not involve affiliation with a union or a professional organization. Collective bargaining represents a means of negotiating solutions to problems which involve one or more of the groups of constituents making up an academic community. Bargaining only about economic issues and/or job security is one way of making the process an instant and constant mechanism of confrontation which goes against the need in higher education to keep barriers weak rather than strong and impenetrable. Faculty must learn how to bargain without destroying the ethos they are trying to maintain. Faculty development issues belong at the bargaining table as well as individual self-interest. Bargaining should be about the quality of the education offered by the institution. This kind of bargaining involves giving as well as getting. Those involved will have no basis for long-range judgments about when to give and when to ask unless faculty, administration, and students have some sense of collective purpose. Faculty development programs can be a powerful agent for the discovery and maintainance of this sense of collective purpose.

3. Evaluation and Faculty Development -- The evaluation of teaching has been a central theme in most of the faculty development programs active in colleges and universities. Evidence to indicate either a change or an improvement in teaching skills is not difficult to obtain. Perhaps this is one reason most faculty development programs concentrate on the act of teaching as a central theme by emphasizing a specific orthodoxy for improvement or a general system of instruction based on technological supports. What remains to be accomplished is the testing of strategies and techniques of evaluation useful for the assessment of the impact of faculty development programs on the institutions they serve. The assessment of institutional change has always been a nebulous issue. Nevertheless, its difficulty should not dissuade those who are competent

in the field of evaluation from applying their skills to the special demands of evaluating the impact of programs while the dimensions of these programs are evolving in response to the many demands placed on them. Historically, education has tended to view evaluation as a univariate phenomenon which deals with one variable at a time. Faculty development presents complex multivariate issues which cannot be understood by dealing with one variable at a time. The evaluation of faculty development programs remains a serious problem which must be addressed if faculty development is to have a creditable knowledge base.

4. Disciplinary Associations and Faculty Development -- The many collectives to which faculty members belong as one way of maintaining the mysteries of the various disciplines which own the content of higher education have recently given evidence of their responsibilities to view their members as persons who have demands placed on them other than those involving research and scholarship. Marty has clearly indicated the ambivalent nature of disciplinary associations in confronting the need to help their academic members become better teachers.[8] Faculty identify with their own kind to a greater degree than they identify with the institutions they serve. Disciplinary associations ignore a significant need for their memberships by neglecting to recognize teaching as a legitimate aspect of the role of scholar-teacher which has historically defined a faculty member's responsibility to his or her institution. The role of disciplinary associations in faculty development is critically important. Associations should accept this role by providing opportunities for the expression of scholarship through effective teaching to be presented as a role model at a level of parity with scholarship alone.
5. The Older Faculty Member -- Much has been written about the mid-career crisis; enough, in fact, to encourage all older faculty members to have one. The older faculty member does represent a special case for faculty development, however, if for no other reason than the fact that the

---

[8] Marty, Myron A., "Disciplinary Associations and Faculty Development", in Vermilye, Dyckman W. (Ed.), Individualizing the System, Current Issues in Higher Education, 1976, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976, 78-86.

average age of faculty is increasing each year in most institutions. By the 1990's, the average age of faculty in higher education could approach fifty years of age. Most of these faculty members will have spent the major portions of their careers at the same institutions. The mid-career issue for faculty development programs will not involve the problem of the worn-out academician who has retired long before his or her time. Rather the issue will be that of providing opportunities for faculty to extend and sustain an already demonstrated excellence which loses its power to motivate in proportion to the number of repetitions involved in its expression. Maintaining excellence requires finding new ways to express it. The quality of educational experiences in the future will depend upon maintaining the excellence in a faculty which won it with enthusiasm at a younger time when the rewards for its attainment were different than those available for its sustainment. Most faculty at this stage in their careers are unwilling to admit publically that their enthusiasm is waning because they view themselves as being valued because of it. Faculty development efforts should give this problem the attention it deserves lest higher education find itself in the predicament of the young being taught by those who are several generations removed, with neither showing enthusiasm for the encounter. Perhaps at that stage in the evolution of higher education, the illusion of learning will become the goal and the cosmetics of teaching will dominate the science of instruction.

Many other issues worthy of separate papers are in need of attention. For example, how should consultant services for faculty development be viewed and used? Can outside consultants be expected to accomplish that which only faculty themselves should be expected to do? What will happen to faculty development programs when the soft money is gone? Raising expectations through foundation support and then being unable to sustain the effort because of a lack of institutional funding may be more damaging than not having the program in the first place. Institutions which encourage faculty development efforts should view these activities as a serious commitment to be supported with hard dollars.

The best of higher education will survive in this country only because those who believe in it are able to articulate a defense which is persuasive enough to convince those outside academe that a college education has a worth far beyond the training received for employment. Binding together the many purposes of higher education is the fact that colleges and universities represent the last major avenue available in our society for the education and expression of talent. Who should be able to defend higher education with greater ability than those who make their professional commitments there; yet, the constituency which should provide the most powerful defense are themselves often the most impotent. The major unfinished task of faculty development is that of relating a logic of purpose in higher education to the improvement and maintainance of an identifiable quality in the experiences of those who are educated. To seek to improve education without a context for why we educate is to teach nonsense syllables and call it communication. If faculty are able to defend what is valued with a logic which is persuasive rather than divisive; with a base of knowledge which is definitive rather than speculative; and with a faith which permits the accommodations of the fads of the moment without losing sight of the permanence of purpose necessary for the future; then, higher education should survive the crises of the moment. Faculty development as a commitment to an essential human resource in higher education has a critical role to play in helping post-secondary institutions "get it together". Higher education is not an industry, and training is not education. Faculty should be developed qua faculty and not as a special class of the industrial elite.